

Karen Gaio Hansberger, Mayor Floyd Petersen, Mayor pro tempore Robert Christman, Councilmember Stan Brauer, Councilmember Robert Ziprick, Councilmember

COUNCIL AGENDA:

July 26, 2004

TO:

City Council

VIA:

Dennis R. Halloway, City Manager

FROM:

Deborah Woldruff, AICP, Community Development Director

SUBJECT:

ZONE CHANGE (ZC) NO. 03-06, TENTATIVE TRACT MAP (TT) NO. 03-05 (TTM NO. 16323) — A REQUEST TO SUBDIVIDE 15 ACRES INTO 86 NEW SINGLE FAMILY LOTS, TWO EXISTING SINGLE FAMILY LOTS, AND NINE LETTERED LOTS LOCATED ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF MISSION ROAD INCLUDING AND TO THE WEST OF THE

EDISON EASEMENT AND PEPPER WAY.

RECOMMENDATION

See recommendations provided on the July 13, 2004 staff report (Attachment 1)

BACKGROUND

On June 13, 2004, the City Council continued this item with the consent of the applicant. The continuance would allow time for staff to facilitate a meeting between the community concerned about the project and the applicant. The meeting was intended facilitate discussion that might lead to finding middle ground or compromise in the design of the project. The main concern that City Council has with the proposed design is the density.

A workshop was held on July 20, 2004. The following comments were given in opposition to the project density, the Neo Traditional design concept, and the implementation of the Mission Historic Overlay District Ordinance within the project:

- There is an appearance of too many houses too close together. The lowest density of 5 dwelling units per acre should be implemented.
- Provide larger side yards and greater rear and front yard setbacks.
- There should be a minimum lot size of 6,000 square feet for small lot subdivisions.
- The number of trips generated from the proposed development is a concern on the impact to existing traffic.
- A limit on the number of building permits issued for residential uses should be considered similar to Redlands.

AGENDA ITEM 3

- The project as designed is too dense and should be redesigned from scratch to consider an alternative housing style.
- This development will set a precedence for development to the north. The project to the north should not be as dense as the area to the south. There is a concern about requiring the development to the north to provide all the commercial, office, and school site uses for the entire area.
- The requirement for 7,200 square foot lots (standard subdivision) should be implemented everywhere in the City. More desired development in this area, if standard single-family subdivision were not approved, would be duplexes, triplexes or apartments with adequate parking. The Neo Traditional model should not be tested out in Loma Linda as an experiment.
- The concept of neo-traditional design and the move away from an automobile dominated design is not realistic. The car is a dominate element in today's culture and should be reflected in the design of development. Today's Loma Linda resident will not walk to grocery stores, parks or other destinations. They will use a car. The concept of commercial development requiring that housing be in place first before they commit to locating within a community is a fallacy.
- At maturity, trees planted within the development will not be able to provide the appearance of covering roof tops as they do in the older parts of the City as viewed from Hulda Crooks Park.
- Any park located under the power lines is not a pleasant park site. The only thing appropriate under the power lines is a trail system that allows you to get from one place to another. A park site under the power lines is not a destination park.
- Neo Traditional communities are more appropriate in urban communities that are much larger than Loma Linda.
- The entire area was identified as a conservation area within the Strategic Plan and the open space should be maintained. A feel of openness and spaciousness needs to be implemented within the Mission Historic Overlay District.
- The project needs to be more sensitive to the Mission Historic District Overlay Ordinance and the "rural" character described within the Ordinance.

Comments were also given that provided constructive criticism of the project and would allow the applicant to address the concerns within the project design:

- There needs to be room for trees to be planted in the front yards.
- A one-story floor plan should be integrated into the proposed tract to avoid a "row-house" appearance.
- Avoid garage-dominated architecture and create driveways with greater length.
- Consider having HOA take care of entire front yards similar to condominium or townhouse development to ensure the appearance of the community will be maintained. If property maintenance is poor the value of the properties surrounded by the tract will be impacted.
- The homes should have a custom home appearance so that houses do not look similar and that have a historic appearance. Appearance and aesthetics in the details of the house design is very important due to the close proximity of the houses.
- The yards should be fenced to allow someone to have a pet (dog).

There were also compelling testimonies given supporting the Neo Traditional concepts and the appropriate location of walkable, livable neighborhoods within the Mission Historic Overlay District:

- Neo-traditional designs can be quite compelling and this opinion has been determined
 after research on the subject and visiting communities that have been successfully
 planned and developed.
- There needs to be more of an effort to get away from the automobile dominated development and allow for trails and connectivity for pedestrian travel. Neo Traditional projects such as this one allow for transit opportunities such as transportation to the University and Hospitals, which may be the employment destination for many future residents within this area.
- Homes to the west of this project on Mission Road are not maintained and the front yards look bad. The HOA for this project will be maintaining all the landscaping which is their biggest operation cost. This project will be guaranteed to look attractive due to the HOA requirement.
- There are individuals who don't want large yards and they still want big homes. The community can't say that nobody should want to live in an area with small lots, small yards and larger attractive homes.
- Consideration needs to be given to affordable housing and the need for housing in this community.
- People are uncomfortable with the Neo Traditional design because it is unfamiliar. People do not like, nor trust the unknown.

At the time of writing this report, the applicant has not submitted any alterations to the proposed plan as presented at the July 13, 2004 City Council meeting.

ENVIRONMENTAL

See recommendations provided on the July 13, 2004 staff report (Attachment 1)

FINANCIAL IMPACT

See recommendations provided on the July 13, 2004 staff report (Attachment 1)

Respectfully Submitted,

ri Lanson

Lori Lamson Senior Planner

<u>ATTACHMENTS</u>

- 1. Staff Report July 13, 2004 City Council Meeting
- 2. Staff Report June 8, 2004 City Council Meeting
 - A. Negative Declaration (NOI/Initial Study)
 - B. Development Agreement
 - C. Tentative Tract Map
 - D. Conditions of Approval
 - E. Planning Commission Staff Report and Draft Minutes May 5, 2004 Meeting
 - F. Planned Community Document

I:\Project Files\TTM16323\CC7-26-04sr.doc